

can quickly destroy civilization.

Deterrence is the ultimate development of the principle of military force in a sophisticated scientific and technological culture. Since the likelihood of deterrence resulting in catastrophic nuclear war approaches certainty, military force cannot be considered a foundation for national security. Science and technology have made military force obsolete as a reliable source for national security.

In regard to the economic implications of military force, the military-industrial complex, as President Eisenhower called it, has had pernicious effects on the nation's economy. In focussing the energy of tens of thousands of brilliant scientists and technicians on weapons manufacture, it has prevented them from working to improve American consumer goods industries. Consequently, Japanese, German, and even South African industries have surpassed ours in the production of automobiles, steel and electronic equipment. Unable to sell their products profitably, many U.S. industries have closed, and hundreds of thousands of workers have been left unemployed.

The billions of dollars spent on weapons have produced few consumer goods and services. Weapons expenditures have been inflationary.

In addition, the enormous military establishment, backed by virtually unlimited funding, has made possible disastrous adventures such as the Vietnam War. The debt generated by this war has further depressed the economy, and the money spent for Vietnam War weapons has further fueled inflation.

In addition to these destructive results of military policies and institutions, increasing numbers of American religious leaders are coming to believe that the use and even the threat to use nuclear weapons is contrary to the deepest religious principles. Even after having fully weighed the dangers of attack and aggression posed by seemingly hostile societies, they tend to believe that it's best both for the nation's physical well-being and for its citizens' souls to seek peace, freedom, and security by means that at least do not include nuclear weapons.

When it can be mathematically demonstrated that the systematic application of military force makes the probability of nuclear war and civilization's destruction approach certainty, the rejection of military force as an instrument of policy becomes the sharpest realism. When religious authorities come to the conclusion that even the threat to use nuclear weapons is wrong, large numbers of religiously inclined people can be expected to become pacifists. These conditions have created the possibility for a pacifist political party.

No pacifist political party can operate on the assumption that pacifist policies are without risks. They include severe risks, for aggression, cruelty, and totalitarianism are rife in the world, and their seeds are in all of us. A pacifist simply makes the calculation that the risks of following pacifist policies are less than those in continuing to follow military ones, and that if the universe has a moral foundation, the willingness to use hydrogen bombs against other human beings is an error.

Such a pacifism can be considered the most scientific and reasonable political outlook possible in our time. Since science and technology won't go backward, the potential for even more terrible weapons will steadily increase. If the human race is lucky enough to survive one nuclear war, its luck will probably run out in the second or third.